

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/688,989

Applicant(s)

TSUNASHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Steven H. Rao

Art Unit

2814

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steven H. Rao.

(3) Daniel X. Yan (54,555).

(2) David L. Soltz, Esq (34,731).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 May 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes

e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 27,28 and 30-33.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kume.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner and ARs discussed the applied Kume reference. ARs will report the interview to their clients and file further papers.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.